



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,268	01/31/2000	Michael O. Cimini	13D13211	4650
29399	7590	03/21/2006		
JOHN S. BEULICK C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			EXAMINER	WOO, ISAAC M
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/495,268	CIMINI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Isaac M. Woo	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 03, 2006 has been entered.
2. Claims 1 and 13 are amended. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 1, "at least one of said tables comprising" in line 8, is redundant. Should it be, -- and --?;

"the error proofing example, at least one failure mode and meta-data defined by the user when creating the at least one error proofing example" in lines 8-11. Should it be, -- wherein the error proofing example, at least one failure mode and meta-data defined by the user when creating the at least one error proofing example --?;

"said database accessed by each said client via said server" in line 11. Should it be, -- wherein said database accessed by each said client via said server --?.

Claim 5 recites, "said class that provides access to said database formats SQL statements" in line 2. It is not clearly understood what is meant by (examiner interprets it as "said class that provides access to said database").

Claim 8 recites, "part families" in line 2. It is not clearly understood what is meant by (examiner interprets it as "failure modes").

As per claim 13, "error proofing *technique*" in line 1, lines 4-5, line 10, and line 13. It is not clearly understood what is meant by (examiner interprets it as "error proofing document");

"the error proofing example" in line 6. Should it be, -- an error proofing example -- ?;

"the error proofing" in line 10. Should it be, -- an error proofing -- ?;

"by a user" in line 10. Should it be, -- by the user -- ?;

"an error proofing example". Should it be, -- the error proofing example -- ?.

Claim 17 recites, "providing access to database formats SQL statement", in line 4. It is not clearly understood what is meant by (examiner interprets it as "providing access to database").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106 (II) (A):

A. Identify and Understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention

The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600,1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some indication of the practical application for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the practical application requirement. See Arrhythmia, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting. For example, a claim directed to a word processing file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 since the information stored may have some "real world" value. However, the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 does not mean that a useful result

is achieved under the practical application requirement. The claimed invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application.

Claim 1 is non-statutory. Because "A system" in line 1, includes claim limitation of "clients", "server" and "database", which provides *no physical structure of the machine in terms of its hardware or hardware and software combination*. Thus, this system is software per se. Therefore, the claim 1 is not a statutory system and should be rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 101 as not being tangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serbinis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466, hereinafter, "Serbinis") in view of Pretz (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,658).

With respect to claim 1, Serbinis teaches a plurality of clients (i.e., computer, 10 and 11 in fig 1A-B, col. 4, lines 41-60), each the client comprising a plurality of user

interface classes (i.e., web browser functions, such as, Java Applet col. 5, lines 16-25) and at least one class (i.e., web browser) that provides access to a database (i.e., store, 30 in fig. 1A-B), (col. 4, lines 31-40, col. 5, lines 16-62); Serbinis teaches a server (i.e., 20A, fig. 1A-B) comprising a plurality of servlets, at least some of the servlets providing at least one of a database and server access capability to each the client (col. 5, lines 4-46, i.e, java servlets for server (java applets for client computer) are used to communicate with computer and server and database); and Serbinis teaches the database (i.e., 30 in fig.1A-B) comprising a plurality of tables (col. 5, lines 26-62, col. 6, lines 19-34), at least one of the tables comprising at least one meta-data (col. 5, lines 26-46) entered by the user, meta-data defined by the user (i.e. uploaded by originator requestor, col. 9, lines 32-48, 80-85 in fig. 4); Serbinis teaches the database (i.e., 30 in fig.1A-B) accessed by each the client (10 and 11 in fig. 1A-B) via the server (20A-B in fig. 1A-B) (i.e., authorized user using web browser on computer downloads document from the database via the server, col. 9, lines 60-67 to col. 10, lines 1-6 in fig. 4). Serbinis does not explicitly disclose error proofing example and one failure mode associated with the error proofing example when creating the at least one error proofing example. However, Pretz teaches error proofing example (i.e., solution to solve problem 44-46 in fig. 4) and one failure mode (i.e., problem 50 in fig. 4, col. 6, lines 11-49) associated with the error proofing example (i.e., solution 50 in fig. 4, col. 6, lines 11-49) when creating the at least one error proofing example (i.e., when the solution for problem is not in database, developing solution and entering solution into database, thus, error proofing example is created a pair with failure mode, 44, 48, 50 in fig. 4, col.

Art Unit: 2166

6, lines 11-49, col. 5, lines 46-60). Therefore, based on Serbinis in view of Pretz, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of the of Pretz to the system of Serbinis in order to provide technical solution information to user for solving problems.

With respect to claim 2, Serbinis teaches each the user interface classes comprises at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input (i.e., web browser, col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25).

With respect to claim 3, Serbinis teaches one of the user interface classes constructs and displays a menu of web pages that a user can view (i.e., web browser, col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25).

With respect to claim 4, Serbinis teaches one of the user interface classes initializes and display forms (i.e., web browser, col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25).

With respect to claim 5, Serbinis teaches the class that provides access to the database and invokes requests to servlets on the server that provide database access (col. 5, lines 4-34).

With respect to claim 6, Serbinis teaches the server comprises servlets for database queries (col. 5, lines 4-34) and updating, uploading a document and updating

Art Unit: 2166

the database, downloading a document, and extracting user permissions from the database (col. 2, lines 63-67, col. 3, lines 6-41, col. 10, lines 36-54).

Claim 7 is rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis. Claim 8 is rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis. Claim 9 is rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 10, Serbinis teaches one of the tables stores data identifying user of website (i.e., list of authorized users for DMS web site, col. 11, lines 21-34, col. 9, lines 9-18). Serbinis does not explicitly disclose the website of error proofing. However, Pretz discloses the database, providing problem and solution information to user (col. 6, lines 11-49), is network-based system that using web-based communication (fig. 1, col. 3, lines 2-34). Therefore, the limitations of claim 10 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim 10 is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 11, Serbinis teaches one of the tables stores textual data (i.e., 85, fig. 4, col. 9, lines 33-49). Serbinis does not explicitly disclose text data relating to the error proofing example. However, Pretz discloses problem and solution information from database (col. 6, lines 11-49) is text file (col. 5, lines 9-20). Therefore, the limitations of claim 11 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim 11 is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 12, Pretz teaches one of the tables stores a principle and related strategy that are associated with an error proofing example (i.e., one of principle strategy to get solution is categorized issue and a plurality of possible solution, col. 6, lines 50-67 to col. 7, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 13, Serbinis teaches a method for given application using a web-based system (col. 4, lines 31-67 to col. 5, lines 1-15), Serbinis teaches the system including a plurality of clients (i.e., computer, 10 and 11 in fig 1A-B, col. 4, lines 41-60) including a plurality of user interface classes (i.e., web browser functions, such as, Java Applet col. 5, lines 16-25), a server (i.e., 20A, fig. 1A-B) including a plurality of servlets (col. 5, lines 4-46, i.e, java servlets for server), and a database (i.e., 30 in fig.1A-B) including a plurality of tables (col. 5, lines 26-62, col. 6, lines 19-34) including at least user defined meta-data (col. 5, lines 26-46) entered by the user to describe, (i.e. uploaded by originator requestor, col. 9, lines 32-48, 80-85 in fig. 4), Serbinis teaches using at least one interface class to provide access to a database (i.e., web browser provides accessing database, col. 5, lines 4-45, fig. 1A-B); Serbinis teaches using at least some of the servlets to provide at least one of database and server access capability to a client (i.e., web browser providing accessing to server and server with servlets providing database accessing, col. 5, lines 4-45, fig. 1A-B); Serbinis teaches entering at least meta-data (col. 5, lines 26-46) entered by the user to describe (i.e. uploaded by originator requestor, col. 9, lines 32-48, 80-85 in fig. 4); Serbinis teaches

accessing a table (col. 9, lines 60-67 to col. 10, lines 1-6 in fig. 4) Serbinis teaches storing in the table (i.e., document uploading, col. 9, lines 60-67 to col. 10, lines 1-6 in fig. 4). Serbinis teaches choosing (i.e., downloading or retrieving, col. 10, lines 3-22) document to fit given application (i.e., specific client application form of documents is retrieved, col. 8, lines 62-67 to col. 9, lines 1-18). Serbinis does not explicitly disclose an error proofing example, failure modes with the error proofing example. However, Pretz teaches an error proofing example (i.e., solution to solve problem 44-46 in fig. 4) and failure modes (i.e., problem 50 in fig. 4, col. 6, lines 11-49) with the error proofing example (i.e., solution 50 in fig. 4, col. 6, lines 11-49) when creating the at least one error proofing example (i.e., when the solution is not in database, developing solution and entering solution into database, thus, error proofing example is created a pair with failure mode, 44, 48, 50 in fig. 4, col. 6, lines 11-49, col. 5, lines 46-60). Therefore, based on Serbinis in view of Pretz, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of the of Pretz to the system of Serbinis in order to provide technical solution information to user for solving problems.

With respect to claim 14, Serbinis teaches using at least one interface class (i.e., web browser, col. 5, lines 4-15, col. 3, lines 13-25) to provide access to a database (i.e., web browser is used to access database via server, col. 5, lines 4-15, col. 3, lines 13-25), and providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a

user and for handling user input (i.e., web browser, col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25).

Claim 15 is rejected in the analysis of claims 3 and 14 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis. Claim 16 is rejected in the analysis of claim 4 and 14 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 17, Serbinis teaches using at least some of the servlets to provide at least one of database and server access capability to a client (col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25), providing access to database; and invoking requests to servlets in the server that provides database access (col. 5, lines 4-26, col. 3, lines 13-25).

Claim 18 is rejected in the analysis of claims 6 and 17 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis. Claim 19 is rejected in the analysis of claims 7 and 17 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis. Claim 20 is rejected in the analysis of claims 8-12 and 17 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IW
March 17, 2006

